DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 117 RC 019 057

AUTHOR Padilla, Raymond V.
TITLE Chicano Studies Revisited: Still in Search of the Campus and the Community. [Chicano Studies: Occasional Paper Series, No. 6.]
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., El Paso. Chicano Studies Program.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 24p.; Contains broken type. For related documents, see RC 019 055-056.
AVAILABLE FROM Chicano Studies Program, University of Texas at El Paso, Graham Hall, 1st Floor, El Paso, TX 79968-0563 ($5; 10 or more copies, $4 each).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; *College Students; Community Characteristics; Curriculum Development; Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; Mexican American Education; *Mexican Americans; *Politics of Education; *Student College Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Chicano Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the status and history of Chicano studies as an academic field of study. The paper describes the development of Chicano studies in terms of philosophical foundations, identifying the Chicano community, curriculum development, and institutional support. The genesis, shaping, and direction of Chicano studies were largely in the hands of college students. The history of Chicano studies indicates: (1) Chicano studies was more a result of a political ideology than of a solid philosophical position; (2) because of the diversity of the Chicano community, Chicano studies participants invented an idealized stereotype of the Chicano community, which was used as a battering ram to gain political concessions on campus; (3) the key issue in establishing the Chicano studies curriculum was its legitimacy; (4) as an undergraduate liberal art's degree, the Chicano studies curriculum is uncertain about the quality of its courses and its relation to career opportunities; and (5) the initial adversial relationship between Chicano studies and academia impacted the kinds of institutional support programs could acquire. The future of Chicano studies as a meaningful activity rests on its ability to survive day by day campus processes. It must reformulate the core concepts that initially gave it spark and energy. It must do so in such a way that it reflects acquired experience and the ever changing political complexion of academia and the communities that support it. (Contains 14 references.) (LP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356117

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dennis J. Bixler-Marquez
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CHICANO STUDIES REVISITED: STILL IN SEARCH OF THE CAMPUS AND THE COMMUNITY

Raymond V. Padilla

No. 6
June 1987

RC 019057

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHICANO STUDIES REVISITED: STILL IN SEARCH OF THE CAMPUS AND THE COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTION

Almost twelve years ago I put the finishing touches on a doctoral dissertation that, if nothing else, has the distinction of being the first formal treatise on Chicano Studies as an academic area of study: It was a case study of the Chicano Studies Program at the University of California at Berkeley. Not surprisingly, very few individuals took notice of the event, even among those involved in the field. The investigation used qualitative analytic techniques, long before they were as fashionable as they are today. I approached the study from the perspective of a participant observer who was interested in understanding how such a program as Chicano Studies functioned for those individuals who promoted it and for the institution that was sponsoring it. The title of the dissertation was Chicano Studies at the University of California, Berkeley: En Busca del Campus y la Comunidad (Padilla, 1974). The title clearly signals the basic conclusion that I reached after several years of research, observation, and participation: **Chicano Studies is a quest to develop a fundamental understanding of both the academic and the Chicano communities, and to find a way to live comfortably in both.** As can be seen from the title of this paper, I have not yet changed my mind on this point. In fact, I am more convinced than ever that this quest is still a key issue for truly thoughtful and active Chicanos who are intellectually alive in the current historical moment.

I have been asked to prepare a commentary on problems and issues related to Chicano Studies in four areas: philosophical foundations, the community, the curriculum, and institutional support. Further, I am to emphasize internal university factors that impinge on these areas of concern. To accommodate this charge, the rest of the paper deals with each of these broad topics in turn. I urge the reader to recognize that my task is to raise issues without necessarily resolving them, to criticize constructively without making anyone defensive, to challenge established views without implying moral turpitude or incompetence for those who hold them, and in general to engage in a lively dialogue with those who think that these issues are important enough to warrant our time, energy and best thought.

Chicano Studies, understood as the quest that I have indicated above, is not dead by any means. We are just getting ready to discuss it in a serious way.

Before proceeding, I need to present one crucial point. I believe (and I think that the evidence bears me

out) that the genesis, shaping, and direction of Chicano Studies, particularly in its earliest days, was largely in the hands (and the heads) of students (Risco, 1974; Sanchez, 1974; Munoz, 1984; CCCHE, 1969). Understanding this student influence is critical to a proper understanding of the many issues that the field of Chicano Studies has faced over the years. In many ways, both the strengths and weaknesses (not to say las inquietudes, las angustias y los exitos) of the field are directly linked to the early and predominant involvement of students.

PHILOSOPHIC FOUNDATIONS

Without trying to be unduly harsh, but as an interpretation of the historical record, I would argue that the field of Chicano Studies received its initial impetus more from the exigencies of a broad, if somewhat amorphous, socio-political movement than from a well-developed philosophical point of view (Sanchez, 1974). Indeed, in some ways, the entire Chicano movement was a political movement in search of a philosophic foundation. But this situation should not be surprising at all, given the youthfulness and sociocultural background of the participants.

If one takes philosophy to include a point of view as to the nature, origins, and destiny of man, as well as a clearly defined perspective on reality, the world, and the cosmos, then one would have to conclude that philosophical concerns were not superordinate in the Chicano movement that led directly to the creation of Chicano Studies. Instead, Chicano Studies as a field emphasized political ideology as an anchor for its activities and as a way to justify its existence. But given the variety of political ideologies to choose from, there was much discussion and even some confusion about the correct political line. To make things even more complicated, the available political ideologies were filtered through what might be called a "rejectionist" perspective. For the youthful advocates of Chicano Studies rejected just about everything that preceded them: Gabacho society; political parties; most of the previous Chicano activists; ethnic labels; business; American democracy; warfare; and even the very universities and colleges in which they had recently become participants. Part of this rejectionist sentiment can be accounted for by the obvious contradiction in which Chicano students found themselves. Here they were, the very first generation of Chicanos who really had an opportunity to attend postsecondary institutions in fairly significant numbers. They were receiving financial aid from federal and state governments. Some had been admitted under special provisions that granted leniency in terms of admission requirements. In many cases students were already receiving special support services, and they certainly were asking for more. In short, these

students had finally gotten aboard the "gravy train" of the American dream.

At the same time, the students still had vivid memories of how things were back at home: In the barrios, the colonias, the migrant fields (from which at least some of them had come), and indeed in Mexico and even the far reaches of Central and South America. The students knew that they were different. But also that they were the recipients of special favors. They were, in short, a privileged few, conscious of their privilege but also of their roots.

The poignancy of the contradiction was made even more evident by the prevailing social conditions. The end of the sixties and early seventies were marked by an ethos of protest against militarism and middle-class culture generally. The "baby boomers" flexed their juvenile muscles and condemned the suburban life-style of their parents, a life-style that for most Chicanos was experienced only through television programs such as "Ozzie and Harriet" and "Leave it to Beaver." But here they were, right along with the White students, protesting against that all-American life-style, a life-style that their parents had not even dared to dream.

And while the White students turned their attention to the "counter culture," Chicano students turned to their own community, and encountered a dichotomous situation. The positive aspect was that people like Cesar Chavez, Reies Tijerina, Corky Gonzalez, and Jose Angel Gutierrez had challenged the establishment as they joined the generation of protestors. It mattered little to the students that these individuals were coming from radically different political perspectives, including the Gandhian pacifism of Chavez, the Zapatista movement of Tijerina, the cultural nationalism of Gonzalez, and the Alinskian-style of political organization of Gutierrez. They were just happy to see that someone was on the move and that the movement was just and anti-establishment.

The negative side was double-edged. First, the students discovered that in fact other Chicanos had struggled before them. There was the GI Forum, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), and political organizations such as PASSO, not to mention the various Chicano-wings of the established major and minor parties. But, perhaps taking a cue from their "baby boomer" peers, the Chicano students made the monumental error of utterly rejecting their predecessors and their efforts. In a grand historical moment of false consciousness, and perhaps self-hatred, they viewed anyone older than a college senior as a vendido, a tio taco, and an opportunist, and generally, a failure. Ironically, they began to display latent racial prejudice. You had to prove your Chicanismo everywhere you went. Their heroes became a

motley collection of romanticized anti-heroes: Tiburcio Vasquez, Emiliano Zapata, Chairman Mao, Che Guevara, and, reaching to the fringes of literary hyperbole, Gabino Barrera.

The second part of this dichotomy is that most of the significant action in Chicano activism was occurring off campus. Chavez had gained political strength by successfully launching nationwide boycotts against agribusiness but the targets of the boycotts were off campus. The other major political figures were active outside of the large concentration of Chicanos in California: Gonzalez was in Colorado, Tijerina in New Mexico and Gutierrez in Texas. So what were the students to do? For one thing, they eagerly joined the farm worker movement. They helped out the workers by picketing local merchants, by garnering support, and by raising consciousness along the way. Yet none of these activities would really have a profound effect on college campuses as academic institutions. So the students had to take more direct action. Their solution was to create an undergraduate academic program: Chicano Studies. In some ways, the creation of Chicano Studies can be seen as the result of two complementary forces: The need of Chicano undergraduate students to establish a positive sense of identity and to come to grips with their history as a people, and the need to become involved in the resurgent political activities of the Mexican American. The sleeping giant had indeed begun to stir.

Clearly, academia is almost the ideal place in which to engage issues of identity and history. Its devotion to the search for truth, to knowledge, to fairness and objectivity, to disciplined inquiry, etc. is the precise characteristic that one would look for to develop the new understanding of self and community that Chicano students sought. And, of course, to the extent that students wanted to use the university to deal with these issues, they were, in fact, right on target.

The difficulty lay in the students' approach and in their lack of refined awareness, about the precise nature of the university as a political institution. The students, most of them undergraduates, were not in a position to appreciate the truly precarious position in which academia finds itself vis-a-vis the larger society. On the one hand, academia supports an idealized view of itself as a "searcher of knowledge and truth" while at the same time its bread and butter is drawn from the society that supports it and that has its own more mundane needs and desires. Thus the university as a political institution is continuously trying to maintain a finely tuned balance between its own ideals and the more pragmatic concerns of those whose support is essential (Hutchins,1936). Moreover, as a social creation, and in spite of its academic traditions, the university must

necessarily reflect the prevailing social norms and expectations, even as it also functions as a critic of society. To put it crassly, there always seems to be a potential contradiction between the high ideals of the university and the more narrow interests of society. Further, since society is stratified in terms of power, the university indeed reflects not merely the pragmatism of society but also, and more notably, the special interests of those who generally hold power in the society.

This subtle institutional contradiction was not something that the Chicano students wanted to deal with patiently and with finesse. Their reaction was to emphasize the power relationships of society implicit in the university and to reject the institution entirely (Risco, 1974). At the same time, they demanded that more Chicanos be allowed to participate in post-secondary education. Obviously, the students correctly recognized that the university is a decisively important institution for any community that aspires to economic and social development. Their problem was to find a way to harness the potential of the university to their needs and what they perceived to be the needs of their own community. Had they understood more clearly the on-going dilemma that academia faces in relating to the larger society, the Chicano students might have achieved some valuable insights regarding their own effort to link the university with broader issues of community development.

Instead, Chicano students launched a broad political attack on the university. The goal was to establish Chicano Studies programs that would represent ". . . the total conceptualization of the Chicano community's aspirations that involve higher education" (Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education, 1969, pg. 10). But what those aspirations might be, and how they had been determined was not clearly spelled out. Nor was the philosophical position from which these aspirations sprang clearly delineated. To be sure some activisits rejected capitalism as a form of organizing society's economic activities. Others accepted Marxist viewpoints of political economy as an alternative but one that seemed alien to the community. Still others adopted cultural nationalism, especially in the arts, literature, education, and, in more subtle form, in the important Chicano critique of social science that began to develop. In fact, cultural nationalism was used with some success to pry concessions from academia.

Borrowing from the syndicalist influences of the Chavez movement, and combining these borrowings with the Chicano students' thirst for self-knowledge and a positive sense of identity, students imbued their activities with the notion of hermandad. They linked themselves in symbolic brotherhood to third world movements for liberation, and they viewed their activities as a struggle for self-determination, for

liberation, and even for the achievement of their destiny. But what might such a destiny be? And who had made it so?

Having been witness to the courageous struggle of black people against the ingrained racism of American society, they became part of the then-current anti-racism crusade. But they chided the timidity of their forebears who had long struggled against Gabacho racism. Perhaps most significant of all, they read the works of Jose Vasconcelos and his ideas about La raza cosmica, yet they utterly failed to come to terms with the proper meaning of the Mexican experience for the Chicano (a failing that is still true today). Instead, they wrapped themselves in native-lore and reinvented the idea of the "noble savage".

They also rallied around a singular and fundamental idea: the need for community. As the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education (CCCH) put it, "Man is never closer to his true self as when he is close to his community" (CCCH, 1969, pg. 9). How remarkably telling is this comment of the alienation that these undergraduate Chicano students felt as they entered the "mainstream" and saw the barrio recede over the horizon. This notion of community would be used by students as a battering ram in an attempt to break down the existing order, to justify the creation of their own structures on campus, and as a means of reconstructing their own identity. The next section provides further elaboration of this topic.

In summary, I would like to propose the following theses regarding the philosophic foundations of Chicano Studies:

Thesis 1. Chicano Studies was more the result of political ideology than of a well-articulated philosophical position.

Thesis 2. Chicano Studies served as a vehicle for dealing with the Chicano students' dilemma regarding their privileged status as students and the economic oppression of their communities which were still considered home.

Thesis 3. Chicano Studies embodied an undergraduate student's perspective of academia and its relationship to the larger society; in particular, this perspective did not include a refined understanding of the inherent contradiction between academia and the society that supports it.

Thesis 4. The creation of Chicano Studies was influenced by an ethos of social protest and intergenerational conflict; as a result, Chicano Studies took on a rejectionist perspective with respect to social institutions in the Chicano community as well as in the larger society.

Thesis 5. Chicano campus activists correctly identified academia as a key social institution, but they were unable to apply its resources to their avowed "revolutionary" aims.

THE COMMUNITY

Even as Chicano students were using the "community" as a battering ram to gain concessions on campus, the ram was in fact mostly hollow. Who was the community? Obviously, it could not be the vendidos, the tio tacos, the sell-outs, the petty merchants, the bureaucrats, or the politicians. It could not be the middle-class Chicanos who aspired to the good life and material possessions. And certainly it could not possibly be the "poverty pimps" who sold out the community to the antipoverty warlords of the sixties. It could not be the midwestern Chicano with his Detroit-black English and acculturationists tendencies ("You mean that there are Chicanos in Michigan?" "Yes, Jose, there are Chicanos beyond Fresno."). In fact, it proved downright difficult to determine who indeed represented the "community".

In many ways the "community" became a kind of reverse stereotype that Chicano students invented in order to consolidate their ranks politically and to bolster their sense of identity on campus. Whereas the Chicano community was in reality fractured along many lines, the students saw it as a homogeneous, idealized entity. While the average Chicano did not even have a high school education, the students expected community persons to possess refined knowledge about how to run a Chicano Studies program on a university campus. Just as the campus community was cold and alienating, the students pictured the barrio as warm and embracing, the land of the authentic chile and taco. The community was thus converted into a quasi-mystical entity that included the "true" Chicanos and excluded the gusanos in waiting. Little wonder then that all loyal Chicanos were required to genuflect as the community was mentioned and acknowledge their fealty to the invisible community out there.

Yet, in some ways the use of the "community" to gain advantage on campus was a stroke of collective political genius. As already noted, academia maintains a profoundly distrustful attitude toward society at large. While it depends on society for its material well being, it shuns society's materialistic aims. While it responds to social pressures and desires, it always maintains some autonomy and distance from worldly affairs. In contrast, here were the

Chicano students openly bringing the community into the academic retreat, a move that was somewhat akin to bringing

the devil into the monastery. Needless to say, the academics were both horrified and mesmerized by the students' community spectacle. But it was precisely that moment of transitory mental confusion in the academic mind that allowed the students to gain their political objective and establish their presence on campus.

We may never know precisely how it came to be that the academic mind was corralled by presumably naive and inexperienced Chicano undergraduates. Perhaps it had to do with general social conditions in the U.S. during the late sixties: The anti-war movement; the counter culture; the social protest of the blacks; the fear of nuclear annihilation, etc. Whatever the reasons, Chicano students managed to fashion a truly potent, if transitory political weapon that gave them a toe-hold on academia. The community battering ram, hollow though it might have been, was indeed a very useful tool for pounding the academic establishment.

However, the actual participation of the community in Chicano Studies programs was much less than spectacular. With the elimination of many professionals, not to speak of businessmen and politicians, from the ranks of "genuine" community representatives, the students turned to pintos, batos locos, farmworkers, and certified professional community representatives (professional Chicanos as opposed to Chicano professionals). Had the community rhetoric actually been implemented, it would have been a case of the uninitiated leading the novices. Fortunately, few thoughtful community persons had a taste for dealing with the mostly sophomoric issues that preoccupied early participants in Chicano Studies. After all, why should busy community people waste their good time watching campus Chicanos engage in petty power plays with each other or with the campus administration? And why should they spend their time trying to help Chicano Studies participants determine how many pencils they ought to buy? To the credit of the Chicano community, they were not taken in by the students' nascent political craft. They merely let the whole thing slowly drift away. It is said (but perhaps it is untrue) that when asked about the proper role for students in the farmworker movement, Cesar Chavez replied that their role was to study. That is quite a revealing statement from a sensible community leader of impeccable credentials.

Going beyond the students' political wiles, one can also understand the predicament in which students found themselves. Here they were, pressing for some sense of pride and identity, eager to learn about their history and their community with hardly anyone around to teach them. Who could they turn to for help in approaching erstwhile adminstrators whose main preoccupation was maintaining normalcy on campus? Certainly not to Chicano faculty who were most conspicuous by their absence from academia. Nor could reasonable

trustworthy and influential Chicanos be found in staff and administrative positions. In short, Chicano students found themselves alone and isolated on campus. They had a desperate desire to latch on to something that was theirs, that they could trust, that would disarm the campus establishment and allow the students to be heard. In the absence of recognizable campus allies they invented one that they could import and utilize with great flexibility. Indeed, if the concept of community had not already existed in the general Chicano culture, the students would have had to invent it just to survive on campus with some sense of self-respect.

Nor should one forget that there was a genuine desire on the part of many Chicano students to help the community in its struggle for justice and opportunities. In their youthful ways they may have erred on occasion because they did not enjoy the luxury of great experience and of having influential positions on campus. Through their efforts, they once again raised the profound question of the role that academia plays in shaping social institutions and challenged all academics to put their lofty ideals into practice. That is an important contribution that ought to have permanent value, notwithstanding the many defects possible in an uncritical use of the community concept on campus.

In summary, the following theses are proposed for the role of the community in Chicano Studies:

Thesis 6. Chicano Studies participants could not clearly define who the Chicano community might be. The actual diversity of the community was overwhelming for Chicano Studies. Their response was to invent an idealized stereotype of the Chicano community.

Thesis 7. The idealized image of the Chicano community was used as a battering ram to gain political concessions on campus. For a while it worked.

Thesis 8. The actual participation of Chicano community members in Chicano Studies programs was trivial in practice and served largely as a political front. It also may have served as an ideological prop for students yearning to maintain some palpable connection to the barrio.

Thesis 9. The attempt to involve community persons in Chicano Studies can be viewed as a fairly sensible political strategy to compensate for the lack of Chicano faculty and administrators who normally would have been the natural allies of Chicano students on campus.

Thesis 10. The focus on the community represented a genuine desire by many Chicanos to help the community in its struggle for justice and opportunities. The challenge they

posed for academia to live up to its lofty ideals is a valuable and lasting contribution that may ultimately benefit the Chicano community and society as a whole.

THE CURRICULUM

Perhaps the most important issue that surfaced with respect to the Chicano Studies curriculum was its legitimacy. No one could dismiss this issue merely by charging institutional racism and leave it at that. But that would be a gross oversimplification of the actual situation. Granted that academia is not immune to racial bias and discrimination, yet this was but one factor in a rather complex situation. One has to recognize that academia thrives on established traditions and is loath to change anything without much discussion and fanfare. To put it in Kuhnian-terms, the academy is paradigm-driven so that drastic changes in thought are possible but not likely to occur in the short-run (Kuhn, 1970). Only when old paradigms have lost their ability to account for empirical data do they lose ground to new ways of thinking and looking at the world. In some cases, key supporters of old paradigms never change their mind no matter what the evidence might be.

Chicano Studies as an academic area of study represented a challenge to the academic mind above and beyond whatever racial prejudice may have existed. In the first place, the creation of any new field is always regarded suspiciously by academics. There is never automatic legitimacy for those who rock the academic boat. As a matter of fact, it has not been that long since academic areas such as science and engineering, not to mention business (Veblen, 1965), were viewed as illegitimate on the campus. The rise of the land grant colleges is but one example of how an entire new sector of higher education had to be created because traditional colleges and universities refused to get seriously involved with the concerns of "farmers and mechanics" (Rudolph, 1962). Bringing new thought to academia is never easy. Chicano Studies was no exception.

But beyond these traditional rigidities in academia, Chicano Studies also represented a particular threat: The activistic orientation of its proponents. As already mentioned, academics try to distance themselves from the "sinful" ways of the world. This has to do with the ecclesiastical origins of universities, their monastic roots if you will. It also has to do with the ideology of science and its professed search for truth even at the expense of more worldly concerns (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). By contrast, the avowed primacy of the community for advocates of Chicano Studies, who literally wanted to bring the community into the campus, grated the academic sensibilities of the scholarly community however much or little it accepted the concept of

social responsibility.

All of this business is in some way profoundly contradictory because in spite of its isolationisttendencies, academia acknowledges that "public service" is a legitimate function of the university. Obviously, Chicano Studies advocates could have argued that their perspective of the community was included in the university's public service function. But this position was not seriously taken by either the proponents of Chicano Studies or by the academic community in general. For one thing, the most outspoken proponents of Chicano Studies often took a separatist-line with respect to the university. They did not really want to be affiliated with the academy. Rather, they wanted to gain access to university resources and use them for their own gains. Often these were vaguely described in pseudo-revolutionary rhetoric. In the most extreme form, this perspective led to an exploitive mentality where the thing to do was to cheat the university whenever possible. In the long run, of course, this extremist position was totally counter-productive even though it was a release for pent-up frustration.

For their part, academics doubted that Chicano campus activists could be involved in public service in any meaningful way. They linked public service directly to expertise in some academic area. In their view, Chicano Studies activists did not have such academic expertise. Moreover, the Chicano's revolutionary rhetoric was alien to the scholarly and empirical orientation of most academics. And given that Chicano students were at the forefront of Chicano Studies, there was no clear channel of communication between them and the mostly Anglo professors who did not really know how to deal with the kind of activism that the students advocated.

The result of this conflict was that Chicano Studies programs were created in spite of not having academic legitimacy as a field. This had far-reaching consequences for the type of curriculuim that academic review committees--composed mostly of Anglo faculty members--were likely to approve. And perhaps most importantly, the review process was used by academics to eliminate the more radical elements of the Chicano Studies perspective and make it more palatable to the university (Gomez-Quiñones, 1974). It should not be surprising therefore that to the extent that Chicano Studies curricula were formally approved, they usually constituted no more than a bachelor's degree and often merely a collection of courses aimed at placating the students rather than establishing a new field.

In spite of these severe difficulties, there were a surprisingly large number of institutions that did in fact create Chicano Studies programs (Armas, 1974). Whatever

misgivings academia may have had about the legitimacy of Chicano Studies, the considerable political pressure that Chicano students generated was enough to make academia at least acquiesce to their demands. But it is one thing to get a program approved and quite another to make it work. The fact of the matter is that Chicano Studies really was a new area of study. As such there was no clear definition of the field, no well-established knowledge base, no established community of scholars, no well-defined research methods, etc. Yet, it fell upon the students (and a collection of "irregular" instructors) to solve these problems. Anyone but youthful, idealistic, committed, and fairly bright students would have looked quite foolish trying to solve these problems with the available resources. In retrospect, we should at least give credit to the students porque no se rajaron.

Given these pressures on Chicano Studies--both from the academic establishment which was trying to normalize it and from Chicano students who did not really know how to put a university curriculum together--the resulting curriculum was not quite satisfactory for any one group although it contained trace elements from every relevant group. Quedo como la falda de Dona Chencha: Larga de la bastilla y angosta de la cintura.

At bottom, the typical Chicano Studies curriculum was a liberal arts curriculum with far too many areas covered in too little depth. Abarcando mucho y apretando poco is the way that I characterized the Chicano Studies curriculum that I studied in the early seventies. Instructors trying to design Chicano Studies courses faced a real shortage of adequate classroom materials. They often had to create the materials, the courses, and the programs simultaneously. In spite of these problems, some Chicano Studies instructors did manage to put together high quality courses, but many others were not quite successful. As a result, some courses in Chicano Studies became known as easy courses for those who wanted to increase their GPA.

But there was an even more serious issue to arise soon after the fervor of Chicano activism died down somewhat. What was a student to do with a degree in Chicano Studies? I seriously doubt that the earliest proponents of Chicano Studies gave this issue much thought. But as students worked their way through the major in Chicano Studies, and as the national economy shifted into a series of recessions following the Vietnam war, the issue became much more salient.

One answer to the question was simply that the Chicano Studies degree was worth neither more nor less than any other liberal arts degree. Unfortunately, many liberal arts degrees were undergoing devaluation as students shifted in

droves from the humanities, social sciences, and education to business, engineering, and computer science. The answer, therefore, was true but irrelevant. The nascent "me generation" needed more than a piece of paper in return for their college investment.

These pressures led to curtailment in the number of Chicano Studies programs and severely limited the growth potential of those programs already in existance. These "progressive programs" began to emphasize their service function by offering courses to students in other majors who might have some interest in Chicano Studies. Those programs with real political muscle on campus managed to get some of their courses included in the general education requirements of their institution. This move guaranteed that at least some students would take Chicano Studies courses and thus support the program's budget.

In retrospect, it seems that the leadership in Chicano Studies failed miserably in relating their curriculm to the career needs of students. It is so ironic that at the same time that Chicano Studies programs were being established there was a national resurgance in bilingual education. Yet, Chicano Studies as a field has played an insignificant role in developing the field of bilingual education. This is so in spite of the fact that almost from the beginning bilingual educators have been emphasizing issues of language and culture. It would seem that Chicano Studies is the perfect academic area to provide the courses in language and culture --at least for Chicano bilingual educators--but in fact very little interaction has occurred between Chicano Studies and bilingual education. Undoubtedly this is one the great lost opportunites of Chicano Studies. Moreover, bilingual education is but one example. Much the same could be said for the other professional areas such as social work, public administration, public health, urban design, etc. Unfortunately, it seems that the Chicano Studies curriculum became frozen in time--prematurely to be sure--as an undergraduate liberal arts program.

In summary, the following theses are proposed regarding the Chicano Studies curriculm:

Thesis 11. The key issue in establishing the Chicano Studies curriculum was its legitimacy. The issue involved not only racism and prejudice, but also the paradigmatic nature of academic thought and its resistance to radical change.

Thesis 12. As a student driven curriculum in an area that lacked many resources, the prototypical Chicano Studies curriculum became an undergraduate liberal arts bachelor's degree or less.

Thesis 13. Once established, the key issues raised about the Chicano Studies curriculum were the quality of its courses and the relevance of the degree to the student's career possibilities. These issues were particularly important in light of deteriorating national economic trends.

Thesis 14. Chicano Studies as a whole shifted from an emphasis on majors to an emphasis on "service courses" for other majors.

Thesis 15. Chicano Studies programs failed to link with various professional programs in education and human services. They therefore forfeited the opportunity to be of real service to the community and lost a valuable chance to grow and develop as an applied field.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

Any discussion of the relationship between Chicano Studies and academia must include the premise that initially an adversarial relationship existed between Chicano Studies programs and the post-secondary institutions in which such programs were established. This relationship was bound to affect most of the important organizational aspects of Chicano Studies, including its goals, curriculum, resources, and operations. Needless to say, it also affected the program's legitimacy on campus and the kind of institutional support that it could garner.

An adversarial relationship implies that program resources are required through negotiations among parties that (1) have an independent and credible base, (2) have clarity about what their interests are, and (3) are willing to accept trade-offs. Given these considerations, and taking a particularly hard nosed view of the matter, one might argue that the Chicano Studies advocates who function under an adversarial framework got as much as they deserved. At least they got as much as they could under the circumstances.

Consider the circumstances of an independent power base. The fact of the matter is that the advocates of Chicano Studies lacked a firm power base. It derived largely from the volcanic but transitory student power movement of the mid and late sixties, a movement of protest that was fueled largely by the prevailing anti-war sentiment and the black's struggle for civil rights and economic opportunity. Ultimately, the student movement rested on the force of a moral argument that the majority society was not living up to its own ideals of democracy, of fair play, and "the American dream". And, of course, in concrete terms it also rested on the ability of students to disrupt campus life through a variety of acts of civil disobedience.

What the Chicano students lacked was a politically-active community contingent that could wield political and economic clout. Such a contingent would have included legislators, businessmen, professionals, civic leaders, etc. The lack of such a group is particularly ironic in view of the strong affinity that Chicano Studies had for the community. But, of course, Chicano Studies advocates thought of the community as los descamisados and not the influentials who might have some pull on campus. As a result, when it came to an independent power base, the proponents of Chicano Studies were largely involved in an elaborate bluff. That they got any concessions at all speaks more to the peculiar American mindset that governs our social ethics than to the threat posed by the Chicano power base as conceptualized by Chicano Studies activists.

From a tactical point of view, the Chicano power base also was weak because of the lack of Chicano faculty and administrators on campus. When it comes down to it, these are the key players that determine the internal dynamics of academia. Nor did the Chicanos have a reliable voice in the governing boards of post-secondary institutions that make such important decisions regarding the allocation of money and personnel to the various institutions of higher education. In short, whether viewed from a community or institutional perspective, the Chicano's power base was insignificant when compared to the power base of those with whom they had to negotiate. In the theory of adversarial relationships, this clearly was a case of David and Goliath.

Next, consider the circumstances of knowing what one's interests are. For early Chicano Studies advocates it was never quite clear what they wanted to accomplish with academia. Some wanted to open up the campus to more Chicano students by establishing recruitment and support programs that included tutoring and financial aid. But others favored a separatist approach arguing that Chicanos had to establish their own institutions in order to make them truly relevant to the community and to avoid the taint that is inevitably associated with the establishment. Obviously, for these individuals there could be no conceivable accommodation on campus and their presence there merely intensified their personal contradiction.

Going beyond these major differences in goals, there were other important issues that practically defied rational accommodation among competing Chicano groups and/or between them collectively and campus administrators. For example, Chicano Studies was not viewed by its proponents merely as an academic program involving courses and possibly degrees. Rather, Chicano Studies was to represent ". . . the total conceptualization of the Chicano community's aspirations that involve higher education" (CCCHE, 1969, pg. 10). In this way, Chicano Studies, nominally an academic program as seen

by the regular campus community, arrogated unto itself a number of student personnel functions: Recruitment and retention; financial aid; counseling; tutoring; providing support groups, housing, etc. In addition, Chicano Studies was to be a change agent both on and off campus. Little wonder then that campus admininstrators should be somewhat bewildered and ask "What do you want?"

As another example, Chicano Studies exhibited considerable strife in terms of its ongoing operations. This internecine conflict was indicative of the ideological battles raging within Chicano Studies as to its purposes and functions. Add to this ideological conflict the alienation across Chicano generations, and lard it all over with a strong dose of individual self-interest and the result was no small amount of confusion as to what ought to be the proper interests of Chicano Studies.

As still another example, it can be said that Chicano Studies could not properly find its place in the academic domain. What kind of unit should Chicano Studies be? A college? A department? A division? A part of ethnic studies? A research center? A satellite operation out in the community? A major? A minor? A concentration? A coalition of minority groups? A student support organization? An undergraduate program? A graduate program? A scholarly community? etc. Obviously, the proper answer to these questions depends on the individual's larger view of Chicano Studies. But since there was no consensus on this score either, it can be said that Chicano Studies advocates held an extremely weak card when it came to knowing what their interests were.

On the other side of the adversarial relationship, the campus administrators were fairly clear as to their interests: Emphasize research and/or teaching depending on the type of institution involved, minimize the community component, insist on academic legitimacy, accommodate the program at the cheapest cost and in the least disruptive level of the organization, all the while keeping an eye on enrollments. In harsher terms: Limit, contain, isolate, placate, and dissimulate. Yet, one has to admit that even the most supportive and committed campus administrator would have had the devil of a time trying to figure out what to do technically with Chicano Studies given the monumental uncertainties involved and the strident voices of the students.

Finally, one has to consider the circumstance of being willing to accept tradeoffs. Obviously, for some advocates of Chicano Studies--the separatists and the rip-offs (not necessarily the same group)--it would have posed an immense contradiction to accept tradeoffs. For others, particularly those who espoused more scholarly interest, and for those who

wanted to open up the university to greater participation by the Chicano community, the historical moment was pregnant with possibilities for tradeoffs and compromises. In the end the grand compromise of Chicano Studies was its willingness to join the academic fold by concentrating on scholarly pursuits. To be sure, all of the volatility and local color of the early days remained but they were softened and muted by the scholarly ways of the new Chicano academic gentry. Given the willingness of Chicano Studies advocates to accept such a compromise, the campus authorities were better disposed toward the program and willing to give it a chance to survive on its own merit and effort. Some may say that this was like throwing an infant to the wolves, particularly the lupine committees on tenure and promotion that guard the campus gates. Yet the child was not without its wiles. Who knows, perhaps Chicano Studies may yet survive as a kind of academic feral child if it can find a proper place to suckle. The result could be a poetic if not altogether fitting conclusion to the Chicano Studies saga: A scholarly Tarzan in the academic jungle.

In summary, the following theses are proposed regarding institutional support for Chicano Studies:

Thesis 16. The initial relationship between Chicano Studies and academia was adversarial; this had a strong impact on the kinds of institutional support that Chicano Studies could get.

Thesis 17. Within an adversarial framework, Chicano Studies had a power base that rested on student protests and lacked significant community participation; as a corollary, the Chicano Studies power base was soft when compared to its opponents.

Thesis 18. Within an adversarial framework, Chicano Studies advocates lacked clarity as to what their interests were. As a result, there was confusion among themselves and in their relations with academic institutions.

Thesis 19. Within an adversarial framework, Chicano Studies trade off revolutionary rhetoric and its community orientation (at least the activistic variety) for a semblance of academic legitimacy and respectability.

Thesis 20. The future of Chicano Studies as a meaningful activity rests on its ability to survive day by day campus processes; further, it must reformulate the core concepts that initially gave it spark and energy, and it must do so in such a way that they reflect acquired experience and the ever changing political complexion of academia and the communities that support it.

CODA

As stated in the introduction, the theses presented in the preceding sections are intended to stimulate dialogue about the status and history of Chicano Studies as an academic field of study. The careful reader will have noticed that no serious attempt was made in this paper to fully defend each thesis. Rather a broad context was provided for each major set of theses in the hope that discussion can be stimulated. And I reiterate my desire not to offend any reader, but to encourage critical analysis. A bloated sense of self does not really increase analytical power.

I would like to end this paper, which is far too sketchy as it is, with some additional remarks about what might be called "second generation" Chicano Studies activities. As has been noted by various observers, the first generation of Chicano Studies programs was strongly influenced by El Plan de Santa Barbara and all that is implied by that document in terms of text and historical context. Obviously, that plan was in many ways a student construction, so it follows that the first generation of Chicano Studies programs also was constructed by the students to a large degree. This raises a natural question: What would a Chicano Studies-type program of effort look like that has been designed by the Chicano faculty and/or administrators?

Recent efforts by just these kinds of individuals have begun to surface. Of particular interest are two "plans": Hispanics and Higher Education: A CSU Imperative (Arciniega, 1985) and Chicanos and Higher Learning: An Action Plan for Chicano Higher Education in Arizona (Padilla and Montiel, 1985). The first item is an example of what might be called "bottom up" planning. It is too early to tell what impact these documents may have on Chicano higher education. And it would be quite interesting to see what elements have survived from the earlier Santa Barbara plan and what changes have been introduced. That chore, however, will have to remain for another occasion.

REFERENCES

Arciniega, Tomas. Hispanics and Higher Education: A CSU Imperative. Long Beach, CA: Office of the Chancellor, California State University, 1985.

Armas, Jose. "The National Concilio for Chicano Studies." La Luz, Vol. 3 (June, 1974), 41-42.

Chicano Coordinating Council for Higher Education. El Plan de Santa Barbara. Oakland, CA: La Causa Publications, 1969.

Gomez-Quinones, Juan. "To Leave to Hope or Chance: Propositions on Chicano Studies, 1974. In Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experience in Education. Harvard, CA: Southwest Network, 1974.

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lincoln, Yvonnna S. and Guba, Egon G. Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1985.

Munoz, Jr., Carlos. "The Development of Chicano Studies, 1968-81". In Garcia, Eugene, Lomeli, Francisco A., and Ortiz, Isidro D. (eds.). Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach. New York: Teachers College Press, 1984.

Padilla, Raymond V. Chicano Studies at the University of Californiaat Berkeley: En Busca del Campus y la Comunidad. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

Padilla, Raymond V. and Montiel, Miguel. Chicanos and the Higher Learning: An Action Plan for Chicano Higher Education in Arizona. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Association of Chicanos for Higher Education, 1985.

Risco, Eliezer. "Before Universidad de Aztlan: Ethnic Studies at Fresno State College." In Parameters of InstitutionalChange: Chicano Experiences inEducation. Hayward, CA: Southwest Network, 1974.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Sanchez, Paul. "Memoirs of a Chicano Administrator." In Parameters of Institutional Change: Chicano Experiences in Education. Hayward, CA: Southwest Network, 1974.

Veblen, Thorstein. The Higher Learning in America (originally published in 1918). New York: Hill and Wang, 1965.

Dr. Raymond V. Padilla is a Professor of Higher Education Administration and Director of the Hispanic Research Center, Arizona State University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1975 in Higher Education Administration and an M.A. in Education from the University of California, Berkeley in 1972. He obtained his B.A. in Spanish Literature (magna cum laude) from the University of Michigan in 1970.

His research interests are in the area of bilingual education and Chicano Studies. Some of his most recent publications include: Advances in Bilingual Education Research, (Editor with E. Garcia) Tucson: University of Arizona Press (1985); Chicanos and Higher Learning, (Editor and contributor with M. Montiel), Tempe: AACHE; Theory, Technology and Public Policy in Bilingual Education, (Editor and contributor), Rosslyn, VA; National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (1983).

The purpose of Chicano Studies is to initiate, coordinate, and promote academic activities in Chicano Studies and related fields. Through the cooperation of a number of departments, a course curriculum has been designed to offer an interdisciplinary major in Chicano Studies and in an Area of Concentration (Minor with various options) to supplement any major in another field. Chicano Studies also promotes, coordinates and/or sponsors a number of scholarly activities including national, regional and local conferences; solicits and disseminates research on Mexican American topics; provides a lectureship series that draws a number of top scholars to lecture on Hispanic topics and initiates and coordinates administrative activities that promote the development of the community of Chicanos/Hispanos.

Chicano Studies is a teaching and research program of The University of Texas at El Paso, an institution whose student population is 50% Hispanic. Moreover, the University is centrally located in the Southwestern border and is part of the City of El Paso, whose population is 63% Hispanic.

Itzamna
Maya god of learning

The Occasional Paper Series on Mexican American topics will be published from time to time when a scholarly paper significant to our community, scholars and University is accepted for publication by our Editorial Board.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE